

Mean-Field Approach to Charge, Orbital, and Spin Ordering in Manganites

Sudhakar Yarlagadda and C. S. Ting

Texas Center for Superconductivity, University of Houston, TX 77204-5932

(February 6, 2008)

We present a mean-field theory of charge, orbital, and spin ordering in manganites at 50% and 0% dopings by considering Jahn-Teller interaction, nearest-neighbor repulsion, and no single-site double occupancy. For spinless fermions, we show that Jahn-Teller distortion and charge-orbital ordering occur simultaneously. In our two-dimensional model at 50% doping, for small nearest-neighbor repulsion the system is orbitally polarized while for larger repulsion the system undergoes *CE* type ordering. As for the 0% doping case, the ground state is orbitally antiferromagnetic. Upon including spin degree of freedom, at both 50% and 0% dopings the ordering remains the same at small antiferromagnetic coupling between adjacent core spins.

71.45.Lr, 71.30.+h, 71.38.+i, 75.10.-b

Manganites of the form $A_{1-x}B_xMnO_3$ (with $A=La, Pr$, etc; $B=Ca, Sr$, etc) display a rich variety of phenomena and phases as the doping x is varied [1]. In particular close to 0% doping the systems display orbital ordering at higher temperatures while at lower temperatures magnetic ordering results [2]. In narrow band materials like $Pr_{0.5}Ca_{0.5}MnO_3$, as the temperature is lowered to T_{CO} the system undergoes *CE* type charge-orbital (CO) ordering and at a much lower temperature T_N peculiar antiferromagnetic (AF) order sets in [3,4] (see Fig. 1). In wider band materials like $Nd_{0.5}Sr_{0.5}MnO_3$ ferromagnetic ordering occurs at higher temperatures and at lower temperatures simultaneous charge, orbital, and spin (AF) ordering results [3,5]. In layered-perovskites like $La_{0.5}Sr_{1.5}MnO_4$ it has been reported that T_{CO} is higher than T_N [6]. In systems where T_{CO} and T_N coincide, Solov'yev and Terakura argue that the CO-ordering is a result of the peculiar AF ordering along with Hund's rule physics [7]. van den Brink *et al.* too analyze systems like $Nd_{0.5}Sr_{0.5}MnO_3$ and find that because of a topological factor in the hopping, the one-dimensional ferromagnetic zigzag chains are orbitally ordered [8]. However Refs. [7,8] do not include electron-phonon interaction physics nor do they consider narrow band systems like $Pr_{0.5}Ca_{0.5}MnO_3$. Evidence of significant change in lattice parameters has been reported at T_{CO} for $Pr_{1-x}Ca_xMnO_3$ (at $x=0.4, 0.5$) [9] and in $La_{0.5}Ca_{0.5}MnO_3$ [10].

In this paper we derive a general framework for analyzing the concomitant charge density wave (CDW) and orbital density wave (ODW) instability by considering Jahn-Teller interactions and showing that the two-dimensional (2D) ordering can be understood in terms of the one-dimensional (1D) Kohn anomaly at wavevector $q = 2k_F$. The problem essentially reduces to comparing the energy resulting from the hopping term for various possible ordered states. We show that Jahn-Teller distortion is accompanied by CO-ordering for the carriers. We find that above a critical value of nearest-neighbor

repulsion and for small antiferromagnetic coupling between adjacent core spins, *CE* type charge, orbital, and spin (COS) ordering is realized at 50% doping. At 0 % doping orbitally antiferromagnetic order results.

We first study the ordering phenomena without spin degree of freedom because $T_{CO} \geq T_N$. We begin by considering CDW instability for a 1D Holstein model given below:

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} a_i^\dagger a_j + \sum_{\vec{q}} \omega_0 f_{\vec{q}}^\dagger f_{\vec{q}} + \frac{A}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{q}, \vec{k}} a_{\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{\vec{k}} (f_{\vec{q}} + f_{-\vec{q}}^\dagger), \quad (1)$$

where a_j ($f_{\vec{q}}$) is the electron (phonon) destruction operator, $\langle ij \rangle$ corresponds to nearest neighbors, ω_0 is the optical phonon frequency ($\hbar = 1$), $A(<0)$ is the electron-phonon coupling, t is the hopping integral, and N is the number of sites. We know that in 1D the non-interacting polarizability $\chi_0(\vec{q})$ (Lindhard polarizability) diverges at wavevector $q = 2k_F$. Then even in the weak-coupling limit we will have a CDW instability because the expectation value $\langle \sum_{\vec{k}} a_{\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{\vec{k}} \rangle$ diverges in the interaction part of the Hamiltonian. Furthermore, upon calculating the double derivative with respect to time of the ionic position coordinate $Q_{\vec{q}} = \sqrt{1/(2M\omega_0)}(f_{\vec{q}} + f_{-\vec{q}}^\dagger)$ by using the relation $\ddot{Q}_{\vec{q}} = -[[Q_{\vec{q}}, H], H]$ we get $\ddot{Q}_{\vec{q}} = -\omega_0^2 Q_{\vec{q}} - 2A^2\omega_0\chi_0(\vec{q})Q_{\vec{q}}$. Thus we see that the renormalized phonon frequency becomes soft even for vanishingly small electron-phonon interaction leading to lattice distortion. The order parameter for the CDW state is $\langle f_j \rangle = \Delta_j e^{i\phi_j}$. Then within mean-field we get from Eq. (1), after averaging over phonon coordinates, the following (see Ref. [11] for CDW in metals):

$$\bar{H} = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} a_i^\dagger a_j + \sum_j \omega_0 \Delta_j^2 + 2A \sum_j a_j^\dagger a_j \Delta_j \cos \phi_j. \quad (2)$$

The energy in the above equation is minimized for $\phi_j = 0$ and for $\omega_0 \Delta_j = -A \langle a_j^\dagger a_j \rangle$.

We will now solve for the CDW state at half-filling, using $\Delta_j = \Delta_0/2 + \Delta_1 \cos(\pi j)$. We first note that $\Delta_0 = -A/\omega_0$ and that $\Delta_1 \leq \Delta_0/2$. Next we add the nearest-neighbor interaction term $V_{NN} = V \sum_{j,\delta} n_j n_{j+\delta}$ with δ being nearest-neighbors and make the mean-field approximation $n_j n_{j+1} = n_j \langle n_{j+1} \rangle + n_{j+1} \langle n_j \rangle - \langle n_{j+1} \rangle \langle n_j \rangle$. Then the Hamiltonian in momentum space, on folding the Brillouin zone, gets modified to be

$$\bar{H} = \sum_k [H_k + H_{k+\pi} + 2AB_+ \Delta_1 (a_k^\dagger a_{k+\pi} + H.c.)] + \omega_0 N (B_- \Delta_0^2/4 + B_+ \Delta_1^2), \quad (3)$$

where $H_k \equiv (-2t \cos k + AB_- \Delta_0) a_k^\dagger a_k$, $B_\pm = 1 \pm zV\omega_0/A^2$ with z being the coordination number, and the reduced Brillouin zone is $-\pi/2 \leq k \leq \pi/2$. Then diagonalizing the above Hamiltonian yields the eigen energies $E_k^\pm = AB_- \Delta_0 \pm \sqrt{4t^2 \cos^2 k + 4A^2 B_+^2 \Delta_1^2}$. Upon minimizing the total energy with respect to Δ_1 we get the optimum $\Delta_1 \approx -A/(2\omega_0) [1 - (\lambda/B_+)^2 + 1/4(\lambda/B_+)^4]$ for small values of λ/B_+ where the polaron size parameter $\lambda \equiv t\omega_0/A^2$. Then the minimized energy per particle is $-A^2/\omega_0 [1 + \lambda^2/B_+ - \lambda^4/(4B_+^3)]$ where the last two terms involving λ represent the *hopping term energy*. We see that including nearest-neighbor interactions does not alter the results qualitatively although it *enhances* the charge modulation.

We will now proceed to consider manganite systems with two orbitals per site. The Hamiltonian consists of three parts $H = H_1 + H_2 + H_3$ where H_1 is the hopping term, H_2 the ionic term, and H_3 the electron-ion interaction term. The hopping term is given by $-t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} e_i^\dagger e_j$ where $\langle ij \rangle$ corresponds to nearest-neighbors in the $\alpha (= x, y, \text{ or } z)$ direction and e is the destruction operator of the orbital $\psi_{3x^2-r^2}$. Here it should be mentioned that for propagation in the x-direction the orbital basis is $\psi_{3x^2-r^2}$ and $\psi_{y^2-z^2}$, for y-direction it is $\psi_{3y^2-r^2}$ and $\psi_{z^2-x^2}$, etc.

To analyze the ordering problem, we consider the orthonormal wavefunctions $\psi_{X[Y]} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}[(\sqrt{3} + 1)\psi_{3x^2[y^2]-r^2} + (\sqrt{3} - 1)\psi_{3y^2[x^2]-r^2}]$ the justification for which will be given below [12]. The interaction term in this basis is given by

$$H_3 = A\sqrt{2M\omega_0} \sum_j [Q_{2j}(a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} - a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj}) + Q_{3j}(a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Yj} + a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Xj})], \quad (4)$$

where a_{Xj} and a_{Yj} are the destruction operators of the electrons in ψ_X and ψ_Y orbitals at site j , with Q_2 and Q_3 corresponding to the two normal modes. The ionic part of the Hamiltonian is then given by

$$H_2 = \frac{K}{2} \sum_j (Q_{2j}^2 + Q_{3j}^2) + \frac{M}{2} \sum_j (\dot{Q}_{2j}^2 + \dot{Q}_{3j}^2). \quad (5)$$

We further enforce that at most only one orbital can be occupied at each site by setting $\langle a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} \rangle \langle a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj} \rangle = 0$.

We study the problem in 2D (say the xy-plane) and observe that the overlap between ψ_X and $\psi_{3x^2-r^2}$ is greater than 96.6% and $\langle \psi_X \psi_{3x^2-r^2} \rangle = \langle \psi_Y \psi_{y^2-z^2} \rangle = \langle \psi_Y \psi_{3y^2-r^2} \rangle = |\langle \psi_X \psi_{z^2-x^2} \rangle|$. Hence based on the hopping term of the Hamiltonian, to bring out the essential physics, we approximate H_1 to be

$$H_1 \approx -2t \sum_{\vec{k}} \left(\cos k_x a_{X\vec{k}}^\dagger a_{X\vec{k}} + \cos k_y a_{Y\vec{k}}^\dagger a_{Y\vec{k}} \right). \quad (6)$$

The 50% doping case will be first considered. In H_3 we note that $\langle \sum_{\vec{k}} a_{X\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{X\vec{k}} - a_{Y\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{Y\vec{k}} \rangle$ diverges at $\vec{q} = \vec{Q}/2 = [\pi/2, \pi/2]$ for the orbitally unpolarized case and at $\vec{q} = [\pi, \dots]$ or $\vec{q} = [\dots, \pi]$ for the orbitally polarized case leading to a concomitant CDW and ODW instability with the phonon frequency corresponding to $Q_{2\vec{q}}$ going soft. To see this transparently we first recognize that for the electrons in the ψ_X (ψ_Y) orbitals the dispersion relation is like the 1D case due to which the Fermi sea is rectangular with $-\pi/4 \leq k_x(k_y) \leq \pi/4$ and $-\pi \leq k_y(k_x) \leq \pi$ for the orbitally unpolarized case. Hence, the Lindhard polarizability diverges at $[2k_{xF}, \dots]$ and $[\dots, 2k_{yF}]$ for ψ_X and ψ_Y electrons respectively. As for the orbitally polarized case, on choosing ψ_Y orbitals without loss of generality, the Fermi sea is given by $-\pi/2 \leq k_y \leq \pi/2$; $-\pi \leq k_x \leq \pi$ and thus the non-interacting polarizability is singular at $[2k_{yF}, \dots]$. Furthermore $\langle \sum_{\vec{k}} a_{X\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{X\vec{k}} - a_{Y\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{Y\vec{k}} \rangle$ ($\langle \sum_{\vec{k}} a_{X\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{Y\vec{k}} + a_{Y\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger a_{X\vec{k}} \rangle$) is similar to the longitudinal (transverse) spin susceptibility in a Hubbard model with ψ_X and ψ_Y orbitals standing for up and down spins. Thus the system, to lower its energy, prefers H_3 to be diagonal in the ψ_X and ψ_Y orbital basis with *only* Q_2 mode getting excited at all sites. The Hamiltonian after averaging over the phonon coordinates yields the following two-orbital 2D version of Eq. (2) with optimum values of ϕ_j and Δ_j :

$$\bar{H} = -2t \sum_{\vec{k}} \left(\cos k_x a_{X\vec{k}}^\dagger a_{X\vec{k}} + \cos k_y a_{Y\vec{k}}^\dagger a_{Y\vec{k}} \right) - 2 \frac{A^2}{\omega_0} \sum_j (a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} - a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj}) (a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} - a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj}) + \frac{A^2}{\omega_0} \sum_j (a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} - a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj})^2. \quad (7)$$

We will now compare the energies for the CDW states in the orbitally polarized and unpolarized states. For the orbitally unpolarized case the order parameter $\langle a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} - a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj} \rangle = C \cos(\vec{Q}/2 \cdot \vec{R}_j)$. Then using the fact that $\langle a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} \rangle \langle a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj} \rangle = 0$, we see in the present 50% doping case that $|C| = 1$ and that we get *CE* type CO-ordering. Then the CDW order parameter is given by

$\langle a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} + a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj} \rangle = \cos^2(\vec{Q}/2 \cdot \vec{R}_j)$. We next introduce nearest-neighbor interaction V_{NN} and note that $\langle n_j \rangle \langle n_{j+\delta} \rangle = 0$ and thus the CDW is also compatible with nearest-neighbor repulsion. Then taking $C = -1$ without loss of generality, the total Hamiltonian is

$$\bar{H} = \sum_{\vec{k}, \alpha=X,Y} \sum_{n=0}^3 H_{\vec{k}+n\vec{Q}/2}^\alpha + \frac{A^2 N}{2\omega_0}, \quad (8)$$

where the momentum summation, for $\psi_{X(Y)}$ electrons, is over the reduced Brillouin zone $-\pi/4 \leq k_{x(y)} \leq \pi/4$; $-\pi \leq k_{y(x)} \leq \pi$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\vec{k}}^{X(Y)} \equiv & [-2t \cos k_x + Vz] a_{X(Y)\vec{k}}^\dagger a_{X(Y)\vec{k}} \\ & -(+)A\Delta_0 [a_{X(Y)\vec{k}}^\dagger a_{X(Y)\vec{k}+\vec{Q}/2} + H.c.] \\ & -Vz/2 [a_{X(Y)\vec{k}+\vec{Q}}^\dagger a_{X(Y)\vec{k}} + H.c.]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We diagonalize the Hamiltonian in Eq. (8) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{X(Y)}^4 + 4Vz\eta_{X(Y)}^3 + 4\eta_{X(Y)}^2 [(V^2 z^2 - A^2 \Delta_0^2) - t^2] \\ - 8\eta_{X(Y)} Vz t^2 + 16t^2 \sin^2(k_{x(y)}) \cos^2(k_{x(y)}) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\eta_{X(Y)} \equiv E_{\vec{k}}^{X(Y)} - 2Vz$ with $E_{\vec{k}}^{X(Y)}$ being the eigen energies for $\psi_{X(Y)}$ electrons. Treating λ as a small parameter we obtain after some algebra the following expressions for the lowest energies

$$E_{\vec{k}}^{X(Y)} = -\frac{A^2}{\omega_0} \left[2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{B_+} - \frac{\lambda^4}{4B_+^2} \left(\sin^2(2k_{x(y)}) + \frac{B_-}{B_+} \right) \right],$$

where terms of order $t\lambda^5$ or higher are neglected. On filling up the lowest band we obtain the energy per particle to be $-A^2/\omega_0[1 + \lambda^2/B_+ - \lambda^4/(4B_+^2)(1/2 + B_-/B_+)]$.

As for the orbitally polarized case, the order parameter is given by $\Delta_j = \Delta_0/2 + \Delta_1 \cos(\vec{Q} \cdot \vec{R}_j)$ and the problem is similar to the 1D one-orbital case [13]. On choosing the ψ_Y orbitals to be occupied, the reduced Brillouin zone is $-\pi/2 \leq k_y \leq \pi/2$; $-\pi \leq k_x \leq \pi$. Then the minimized energy per particle is, as before, $-A^2/\omega_0[1 + \lambda^2/B_+ - \lambda^4/(4B_+^2)]$. It is of interest to note that for small nearest-neighbor repulsion V , the energy of the orbitally polarized state is lower than that of the orbitally unpolarized state while for $Vz > A^2/\omega_0$ it is higher than that of the CE type state.

We will now consider the 0% doping case. Here we get an ODW instability at $\vec{q} = \vec{Q}$ leading to an orbitally antiferromagnetic state. The reduced Brillouin zone for $\psi_{X(Y)}$ orbital is $-\pi/2 \leq k_x(k_y) \leq \pi/2$; $-\pi \leq k_y(k_x) \leq \pi$. The ground state energy per particle when λ is a small parameter is obtained to be $Vz - A^2/\omega_0[1 + \lambda^2/2 - 3\lambda^4/32]$. As for the orbitally polarized case, the energy per particle is $-A^2/\omega_0 + Vz$. Thus we see that the energy for the orbitally unpolarized case is *lower* than that for the orbitally polarized case at 0% doping.

We will now include spin degree of freedom and analyze the magnetic ordering that results from the CO-ordering derived above. We consider antiferromagnetic spin coupling between adjacent localized core spins of the form $\frac{J}{2} \sum_{j,\delta} \vec{S}_j \cdot \vec{S}_{j+\delta}$ ($J > 0$ and $S = 3/2$) and an infinitely strong Hund's coupling between itinerant electrons and localized spins. Then in the Hamiltonian, the kinetic energy becomes $-t \sum_{[ij]} \cos(\theta_{ij}/2) (a_{Xj}^\dagger a_{Xj} + a_{Yj}^\dagger a_{Yj})$ where $[ij]$ are nearest-neighbors in the $x(y)$ -direction for $\psi_{X(Y)}$ orbital electrons, θ_{ij} is the angle between adjacent core spins $\vec{S}_i$ that are treated classically. As for the 2D two orbital case at 50% doping, for a CE type magnetic ordering we get the same expectation value for the kinetic energy because $\theta_{ij} = 0$ when an electron in the $\psi_X(\psi_Y)$ orbital tries to jump to the next unoccupied orbital in the x - (y -) direction (see Fig. 1). The nearest-neighbor core spin coupling gives zero value. The contribution from the remaining *spin independent* terms in the Hamiltonian is the same as before and thus the total energy per particle remains the same for this spin order. On the other hand if the system is totally spin antiferromagnetic, the kinetic energy is zero and the core spin interaction energy per particle is $-4JS^2$. Thus we see that if the magnitude of the hopping term energy per particle is more than $4JS^2$ we get CE type COS ordering in 2D [14]. As for the case when the system is orbitally polarized (say of ψ_Y orbitals), if the magnetic ordering comprises of spin polarized chains in the y -direction that are antiferromagnetically coupled in the x -direction (see Fig. 2), the energy per particle is still the same as when the spin effects are ignored [15]. On the other hand if the orbitally polarized case is completely spin antiferromagnetic again the kinetic energy is zero and the core spin interaction energy per particle is $-4JS^2$. Thus here too we see that if the magnitude of the hopping term energy per particle is less than $4JS^2$, AF order results (see Fig. 3).

As for the 0% doping case, when the magnitude of the hopping term energy per particle is more than $4JS^2$, similar analysis as above yields an orbitally antiferromagnetic and spin ferromagnetic state. Otherwise, the system is spin antiferromagnetic.

The above analysis can be extended to other dopings as well. All in all, we feel that our analysis explains the COS ordering in layered compounds like $La_{0.5}Sr_{1.5}MnO_4$ and narrow-band systems like $Pr_{0.5}Ca_{0.5}MnO_3$ where $T_{CO} > T_N$. Since we have shown that magnetic ordering results from the CO ordering, our analysis should also hold for wider-band systems like $Nd_{0.5}Sr_{0.5}MnO_3$.

The authors would like to thank W. P. Su, G. Baskaran, R. Pandit, L. Sheng, J. Zhu, and Y. Murakami for discussions. This work was supported by Texas Center for Superconductivity, a grant from Texas ARP (ARP-003652-0241-1999), and by the Robert Welch Foundation.

[1] A. P. Ramirez, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **9**, 8171 (1997).
[2] J. Rodríguez-Carvajal *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **57**, R3189 (1998).
[3] Y. Tokura and N. Nagaosa, Science **288**, 462 (2000).
[4] M.v. Zimmermann *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4872 (1999).
[5] H. Kawano *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4253 (1997).
[6] Y. Murakami *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1932 (1998).
[7] I. V. Solovyev and K. Terakura, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2825 (1999).
[8] J. van den Brink, G. Khaliullin, D. Khomskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 5118 (1999).
[9] M.v. Zimmermann *et al.*, cond-mat/0007231.
[10] P. G. Radaelli *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 3015 (1997).

[11] G. Grüner, *Density Waves in Solids*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994), Ch. 3.
[12] The importance of understanding the orbital ordering, at 0% doping, in terms of ψ_X and ψ_Y orbitals was recognized by P. B. Allen and V. Perebeinos, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 10747 (1999); L. Sheng and D. N. Sheng, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **13**, 1397 (1999).
[13] For $V_{NN} = 0$, the ordering can also be at $\vec{q} = [\pi, 0]$.
[14] One can expect the observed stacking of like orbitals in the z-direction (see Ref. [3]) when antiferromagnetic coupling energy compensates for the nearest-neighbor repulsion in this direction.
[15] At 50% doping, in the absence of spin effects, for the *exact* kinetic energy term $-t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} e_i^\dagger e_j$, ordered state of $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbitals has the lowest energy. However upon introducing spin effects, for sufficiently large J , the orbitally ordered state with $d_{3x^2-r^2}$ orbitals (or ψ_X orbitals in our approximation) is more favorable.

FIG. 1. CE ordering in x-y plane. Exaggerated Q_2 distortion is shown by the dash-dot line and the zig-zag ferromagnetic chains by dashed lines. The Mn^{3+} sites are depicted by $\Psi_{X,Y}$ orbitals and core spins, the Mn^{4+} sites by only core spins, and the oxygen sites by $\bigcirc$.

FIG. 2. Orbitally polarized state in x-y plane. Exaggerated Q_2 distortion is shown by the dash-dot line and the ferromagnetic chains by dashed lines. The Mn^{3+} sites are depicted by Ψ_Y orbitals and core spins, the Mn^{4+} sites by only core spins, and the oxygen sites by $\bigcirc$.

FIG. 3. Phase diagram for the 50% doping case in 2D.





